

**The Ramakrishna Mission
Institute of Culture Library**

Presented by

Dr. Baidhuan Mukerji

RMICL-8

4228

SEVERAL TRACTS
ON
HINDOO THEISM, &c.

CONTAINING
THE THIRD AND FOURTH NUMBERS OF THE
BRAHMUNICAL MAGAZINE,
A CONTROVERSY BETWEEN DR. TYTLER AND RAMDOSS,

AND
BABOO PRUSUNNU KOOMAR THAKOOR'S
HUMBLE SUGGESTIONS TO HIS COUNTRYMEN WHO
BELIEVE IN THE ONE TRUE GOD.

REPRINTED, BY
THE DIRECTION OF THE COMMITTEE OF
THE TUTTUBOADHINEY SOBHA,

AT THE
TUTTUBOADHINEY PRESS,
CALCUTTA.

1845.

R M I C LIBRARY	
Acc. No. 4228	
Class No. 2045	
Date	
M. Card	
...	✓
Lat.	✓
Bk. Card	✓
Checked	RDH

PREFACE.



For a period of upwards of fifty years this country (Bengal) has been in exclusive possession of the English nation, during the first thirty years of which from their word and deed it was universally believed that they would not interfere with the religion of their subjects and that they truly wished every man to act in such matters according to the dictates of his own conscience : their possessions in Hindoostan and their political strength have through the grace of God gradually increased. But during the last twenty years a body of English Gentlemen who are called missionaries have been publicly endeavouring in several ways to convert Hindoos and Mussulmans of this country into Christianity. The first way is that of publishing and distributing among the natives various books large and small reviling both religions and abusing and ridiculing the gods and saints of the former : the second way is that of standing in front of the doors of the natives or in the public roads to preach the excellency of their own religion and the debasedness of that of others : the third way is that if any natives of low origin become Christians from the desire of gain or from any other motives, these Gentlemen employ and maintain them as a necessary encouragement to others to follow their example.

It is true that the apostle of Jesus Christ used to preach the superiority of the Christian religion to the natives of

different countries, but we must recollect that they were not of the rulers of those countries where they preached. Were the missionaries likewise to preach the Gospel and distribute books in countries not conquered by the English such as Turkey and Persia &c. which are much nearer England they would be esteemed a body of men truly zealous in propagating religion and in following the example of the founders of Christianity. In Bengal where the English are the sole rulers and where the mere name of Englishman is sufficient to frighten people : an encroachment upon the rights of her poor timid and humble inhabitants and upon their religion cannot be viewed in the eyes of God or the Public as a justifiable act : for wise and good men always feel disinclined to hurt those that are of much less strength than themselves and if such weak creatures be dependent on them and subject to their authority they can never attempt even in thought to mortify their feelings.

We have been subjected to such insults for about nine centuries and the cause of such degradation has been our excess in civilization and abstinence from slaughter even of animals ; as well as our division of cast which has been the source of want of unity among us.

It seems almost natural that when one nation succeeds in conquering another, the former, tho' their religion may be quite ridiculous, laugh at and despise the religion and manners of those that are fallen into their power ; for example Mussulmans upon their conquest of India proved highly inimical to the religious exercises of Hindoos : when the generals of Chungez khan, who denied God and were like wild beasts in their manners, invaded the western part of Hindoostan, they universally mocked at the profession of God and of futurity expressed to them by the natives of India : the savages of Arracan on their invasion of the eastern part of Bengal always attempted to degrade the religion of Hindoos. In the ancient days the Greeks and the Romans who were gross idolaters and immoral in their lives used to laugh at the religion and conduct of their Jewish subjects a sect who were devoted to the belief of one God. It is therefore not uncommon if the English missionaries who are of the conquerors of this country revile and mock at the religion of its na-

tives. But as the English are celebrated for the manifestation of humanity and for administering justice and as a great many Gentlemen among them are noticed to have had an aversion to violate equity, it would tend to destroy their acknowledged character if they follow the example of the former savage conquerors in disturbing the established religion of the country, because to introduce a religion by means of abuse and insult or by affording the hope of worldly gain is inconsistent with reason and justice. If by the force of argument they can prove the truth of their own religion and the falsity of that of Hindoos, many would of course embrace their doctrines and in case they fail to prove this they should not undergo such useless trouble nor tease Hindoos any longer by their attempt at conversion. In consideration of the small huts in which Brahmuns of learning generally reside and the simple food such as vegetables &c. which they are accustomed to eat and the poverty which obliges them to live upon charity the missionary Gentlemen may not I hope abstain from controversy from contempt of them : for truth & true religion do not always belong to wealth and power ; high names or lofty palaces.

NUMBER THIRD.

OF THE

BRAHMUNICAL MAGAZINE.



In the *Friend of India* No. 38 a reply has been made in English to the 2d. number of the *Brahmunical Magazine* composed both in English and Bengally and published a few weeks ago. As the controversy in question is intended by both parties chiefly for the benefit of the Hindoo community and secondarily for the use of Europeans, I feel much disappointed in my expectation of being favoured by the Editor or his colleagues with a reply in English and Bengally to insert in the next number of my magazine ; I however must receive it as it is, and beg to be allowed to make a few remarks on the reply.

As to my first question proposed in the magazine in the following words. " They call Jesus Christ the son of God and the very God—how can the son be very father ?" the Editor denies the accuracy of the information on which I found this question, and firmly asserts that " the Bible no where says that the son is the father." I therefore deem it necessary to shew my reason for the above query, leaving it to the public to pronounce on the justifiableness of it. Christian teachers profess that God is one, and that Jesus Christ is the son of God, and the very God : Hence I naturally concluded that they believe the son to be the father ; and consequently questioned the reasonableness of such a doctrine. For when a person affirms that such a one, say James, is one, and that John is his son ; and again says that John is actually James ; we should naturally conclude that he means that John the son is James the father, and be at liberty to ask how can

John the son be James the father ? But as the Editor a leading minister of that religion declares that " the Bible nowhere says that the son is the father, but says that the son is equal to the father in nature and essence" and " distinct in person" &c. and recommends me to reflect on mankind, of whom " every son, who has not the same human nature with his father, must be a monster." It would be too much boldness on my part to give preference to my apprehension of the meaning of the Bible over that of the Editor. I would therefore have admitted (as suggested by the Editor) that the son of God is God, on the analogy and in the sense that the son of a man is a man, had I not been compelled by his very suggestion to reject entirely his other still more important assertion, that is, the coeval existence of the son with the father. For, the belief of the nature of the son of man being the same as that of the father, though it justifies the idea of the son of God being God, is utterly repugnant to the possibility of the son being coeval with his father. It is evident that if a son of man be supposed coeval with his father, he must be considered something more extraordinary than a monster !

It is believed by all religious sects, that when God reveals his will or law to the human race, he reveals it through their language in its common acceptation. I beg, therefore, of the Editor, to favour me with a direct reply to the following question—Do the Missionary Gentlemen take the word " God" as a proper name or as a common one ; all nouns being divided into two kinds, common and proper ? In the former case, that is, if they consider the term " God" appropriated to one individual existence as every other proper name is, they must relinquish the idea of the son of God being the very God. How can we think the son of John or James to be John or James, or coeval with John or James ? And in the latter case, that is, if they receive the term " God" as a common name, they may maintain the opinion that the son of God is God, in the same way as the son of a man is man, which, as the Editor says, must necessarily be the case ; but they, in this case, cannot be justified in professing a belief in the equal duration of the son with the father ; for every son, whatever may be his nature, must have existence

originating subsequently to that of his own father. The only difference between these two common nouns " God" and " man" would be, that the latter includes a great many individuals under it and the former only three distinct persons, though of superior power and nature. But no smallness of the number or mightiness of power of persons under one common name, can exclude it from being classed as a generic noun ; for it is well established by the observers of nature that the number of individuals comprised under the term " mankind" is much less, and their nature is far more mighty, than the living embryos in the milt of a single cod-fish—a circumstance which does not make man less a genus than the term fish.

We see individuals under one term of mankind, though they are distinct in person, yet one in nature, as being all men : in like manner three beings under one godhead according to the Editor, tho' they are distinct in person are yet, I infer, considered by him one in nature as gods ;—god the Father, god the Son, and god the Holy-ghost. Is this the unity of God which the Editor professes ? Can this doctrine justify him in ridiculing Hindoo polytheism, because many of them say, that under one Godhead there are more than three beings distinct in person but one in nature ?

As to my third question " they say God is one, and yet say that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy-Ghost is God ;" the Editor admits the fact, as he says, that " Bible ascribes the same divine nature and perfections to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and yet declares that though distinct in person they are one in nature and attributes ;"—that " it (the Bible) teaches men to worship each of them as God," and that " the Father, Son and Holy-Ghost are described in Scripture as equally giving grace and peace to men,—as pardoning sin and leading men into the paths of righteousness." But instead of shewing the reasonableness of the idea of three distinct gods being one God, as requested, he confesses the total inconsistency of this doctrine with reason and makes the Bible responsible for it, saying " But the Bible, while it fully reveals these facts, still forbears to inform us how the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit exist and form the triune God ," and adds, " nor, had

it informed us, are we certain that we should have comprehended it." The Editor or his colleagues ought to have taken into consideration such unreasonableness attaching to the most important of all their doctrines, before they had published in the "Sumachar-Durpun" the letter accusing the Vaidanta and the rest of the Hindoo Shastrus of want of reason—a circumstance which might have saved the Editor the reluctant avowal of the unreasonableness of the foundation of his own system of faith. The Editor however attempts to procure belief for this doctrine so palpably contrary to reason and experience, under the plea that "there are many things which pass around and within us of the manner of which we can form no just idea, though no one doubts their truth: we know not how plants and trees draw matter from the earth and transform it into the leaves, flowers, and fruits, although no one questions the fact;—nor how mind so acts upon matter as to enable a man at will to raise his hand to his head, and with it to perform the hardest labour. Until we comprehend the manner in which these operations on matter are effected, which constantly pass around and within us, we have little reason to complain, because the triune God has not condescended to inform us of the precise mode in which his infinite and glorious nature exists and acts." How is it possible for the Editor, or for any one possessed of common sense, not to perceive the gross error of drawing analogy from things around and within us, to the three distinct persons of the God-head in one existence; which so far from being around or within us, exists only in the imagination of the missionaries.

Here the growth of a tree and its producing leaves and flowers, as well as the operation of mind on matter, being around and within us, are commonly perceptible by all men whether Christians or not Christians; a denial of which is utterly impossible for one who is possessed of the senses. It is very true that the exact manner in which plants grow or the mind operates, and the precise principles of nature which act upon them, are not thoroughly understood. But all that these facts amount to is, that things around or within us, whether visible or demonstrated by visible facts, compel conviction. Do the three distinct persons of the God-head in unity

exist like growing trees or bodies joined to mind ? Are they phenomena commonly perceptible alike by Christians and not Christians ? Or are they like mountains of ice in northern countries, which, tho' they are not seen or felt by us, yet are reported to us by eye-witnesses, without any contradiction from others who have also passed the places where they are said to exist, and where they are liable to be seen by any one—that we should be compelled to believe the existence of the triune God like that of growing trees, operating minds, or mountains of ice, though we cannot understand them ; or rather though we find them exactly contrary to what we have understood ? Christians may perhaps consider the Trinity as perceptible by them, through the force of early instructions, in the same manner as the followers of the Tunttru doctrines among Hindoos in Bengal consider God as consisting of five distinct persons and yet as one God ; and as the generality of modern Hindoos esteem numerous incarnations under one Godhead almost as an experienced fact from their early habits. How can Christians who in general justly pride themselves on their cultivated understanding, admit such an analogy or justify any one in misleading others with such sophistries ? The only excuse which I feel inclined to make for them, and perhaps a true one is, that the enlightened amongst them, like several of the Greek and Roman Philosophers, yield, through policy, to the vulgar opinions, though fully sensible of the unjustifiableness of them. I am however sorry to observe that the minds of a great number of Christians are so biassed in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity, from the strong impression made on them by education in their youth, that they can readily defy the suggestions of the senses, reason and experience in opposition to this doctrine. They accuse Brahmunicipal priests of having an unjust ascendancy over their pupils, while they forget how greatly Christians are influenced by their ministers so as to overlook the error of such an analogy as the above, and others of a similar nature.

The Editor has first declared that “ the Bible forbears to inform us how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit exist &c. the triune God has not descended to inform us of the precise mode in which his infinite and glorious nature

exists and acts ;"—nevertheless he particularizes the mode of their existence, and actions, separately and distinctly from the authority of the Bible ; stating that " the Son who has existed with the Father from eternity has created heaven and earth ;" that " from his infinite pity to sinful men he condescended to lay aside his glory for a season ;" that " taking on himself the form of a servant he might worship and obey the father as his God ;" that " he prayed his father to glorify him only with his own glory, which he had with his father before the foundation of the world, and which for a season he had laid aside ;" that " he was permitted to ascend up where he was before ;" and that lastly " he was seated at the right-hand of the Majesty on high" who " gave him as mediator all power in heaven and earth ;" and that " God the Spirit was also pleased to testify to men his approbation of the Son's becoming incarnate, by visibly descending upon him in the form of a dove." Notwithstanding their different locations, different actions, and distinct existences, the Editor represents them as one ; and also demands of the rest of the world a belief in their unity. Is it possible even to conceive for a moment the identity between three Beings, one of them in heaven expressing his pleasure at the conduct of the second, who at the same time on the earth was performing religious rites, and the third of them then residing between heaven and earth descending on the second at the will of the first. If the difference of bodies and situation as well as of actions and employments, be not sufficient to set aside the idea of the identity and real unity of persons, there would be no means of distinguishing one person from another, and no criterion would be left for considering a tree different from a rock or a bird from a man. Is this the doctrine which the Editor ascribes to God ? And can any book, which contains an idea that defies the use of the senses, be considered worthy to be ascribed to that Being who has endued the human race with senses and understanding for their use and guidance ? As long as men have the use of their senses and faculties, (unless sunk in early prejudices) they never can be expected to be deluded by any circumlocutions founded upon circumstances not only beyond understanding but also contrary to experience and to the

evidence of the senses. God the Son is declared by the Editor to have laid aside his glory for a season, and to have prayed his father to give him the same glory, and also to have taken the form of a servant. Is it consistent with the nature of the immutable God to lay aside any part of his condition and to pray for it again ? Is it conformable to the nature of the Supreme Ruler of the universe to take the form of a servant, though only for a season ? Is this the true idea of God which the Editor maintains ? Even idolaters among Hindoos have more plausible excuses for their polytheism. I shall be obliged, if the Editor can shew that the polytheistical doctrines maintained by Hindoos are, in any degree, more unreasonable than his own : if not, he will not, I trust, endeavour in future to introduce among them one set of polytheistical sentiments as a substitute for another set ; both of them being equally and solely protected by the shield of mystery.

The Editor acknowledges the fact of God's appearing in the shape of a Dove to testify the appointment of God the Son, stating, that " when God renders himself visible to man, it must be by appearing in some form." But I wonder how after such an acknowledgment, the Editor can ridicule ✓ the idea of God's appearing in the shape of a fish or cow, which is entertained by the Pouranik * Hindoos ? Is not a fish as innocent as a dove ? Is not a cow more useful than a pigeon ?

All that I said of the Holy-Ghost is as follows. " Did not the Holy-Ghost, who is very God, in the form of a dove remove from one place to another ? And did he not beget Jesus Christ by his divine intercourse with a woman ?"—alluding in the former question to his descent on Jesus Christ, when baptized, in the shape of a dove ; and in the latter to his having begot Christ by a woman not married to him, as is evident from their Scriptures : " She was found with child of the Holy-Ghost : " Matt Chap. I. v. 18. " The Holy-Ghost shall come upon thee." Luke Chap. I. v. 35 Both of these circumstances are solemnly acknowledged by the Editor. But whence or how the Editor infers again

* Mythological.

my misrepresentation of the fact, and my attempt to ridicule the doctrine, I am unable to discover.

As to my fourth question viz. "They say that God must be worshipped in spirit, and yet they worship Jesus Christ as very God, although he is possessed of a material body;" the Editor has given an evasive answer; for he says, "Christians worship Jesus Christ and not his body separately from him." I never charged Christians in my question with worshipping the body of Jesus Christ separately from himself, that the Editor could be justified in denying Christians' having worshipped him and not his body: the Editor in fact confesses their adoration of Jesus Christ as the very God in the material form; nevertheless he attempts to maintain that they worship God in spirit. If we admit that the worship of spirit possessed of material body is worship in spirit, we must not any longer impute idolatry to any religious sect: for none of them adore mere matter unconnected with spirit. Did the Greeks and Romans worship the bodies of Jupiter and Juno and their other supposed Gods separately from their respective spirit? Are not the miraculous works ascribed by them to these Gods, proofs of their viewing them as spirits connected with the body? Do the idolaters among Hindoos worship the assumed forms of their incarnations divested of their spirit? Nothing of the kind! Even in worshipping idols, Hindoos do not consider them objects of worship until they have performed *Pranprutistha* or communication of divine life. According to the definition given by the Editor, none of them can be supposed idolaters, because they never worship the body separately from the spirit. But in fact any worship through either an artificial form or imaginary material representation is nothing but idolatry.

Moreover the Editor says that "The Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost are also described in scripture as equally giving grace and peace to man; as pardoning sin and leading men in the paths of righteousness; which things omniscience, omnipotence, infinite love and mercy can alone perform." I do not know any polytheistical system more clear than this description of the Editor, as declaring three Beings equally omniscient, omnipotent, and possessed of infinite mercy. I however beg to ask, whether the omnipotence, omniscience,

and infinite mercy of one person is sufficient or not to arrange the universal system and preserve its harmony ? If so, an admission of the omnipotence and omniscience of the second and the third is superfluous and absurd ; but if not sufficient, why should we stop at the number three and not carry on the numeration until the number of omnipotent Beings becomes at least equal to that of the heavenly bodies, ascribing to each the management of every Globe ? From the skill which Europeans generally display in conducting political affairs and effecting mechanical inventions, foreigners very often conclude that their religious doctrines would be equally reasonable ; but as soon as any one of them is made acquainted with such doctrines as are professed by the Editor and with the histories of the ancient Greeks and Romans, he will firmly believe that religious truth has no connection with political success.

My fifth question was, " How can equality subsist except between objects possessed of different essences and existences ? " But the Editor repeats only a part of it i. e. how the son can be equal with the father, when he does possess the same nature, and then declares the question unintelligible. I never meant the impossibility of equality between persons or things that possess the same nature ; as we find often equality in some property subsisting between man and man, though possessing the same nature ; but as no equality can subsist except between things of different existences ; and the professed belief of the missionary Gentlemen was, that the Son is the same in existence as well as in nature with the father. I took the liberty to ask how the son can be equal with the father, when he is supposed to be possessed of the same nature and existence ? Unless they deny to the Son the same existence with the Father, they cannot, I think maintain his equality with the Father. I, therefore, presume my question is perfectly intelligible.

As to my second remark, viz. " they sometimes call Jesus Christ the son of man, and yet say no man was his Father," the Editor makes the following reply. " While, thus incarnate, he in many ways unavoidably displayed his divine nature ; but being born of a woman and in all things like unto us as to his human nature, yet without sin, he condescended to

call himself the Son of man, although no man was his Father." I wonder that the Editor who on one hand attempts so warmly to prove the deity and inspiration of Jesus Christ, on the other hand accuses the same being of having declared what was totally contrary to the fact, saying that he condescended to call himself the Son of man, although no man was his Father. I also feel surprized at the inconsistency of the Editor, who, while justifying the above statement respecting his Lord, charges the Hindoo-Pouraniks with falsity; because the Poorans, in instructing men of weak understanding, have made allegorical representations of God, though they repeatedly confess the allegorical nature of their instructions and explain their motives for introducing them. Besides, he imputes false representation to one of the commentators of the Vaidā, and that only in his instructing the ignorant in a parabolical manner; and from this single circumstance he condemns "the whole of the Hindoo System."

In the very reply of the Editor, I find the phrase "at the right hand of God"—quoted by the Editor as a scriptural expression. I therefore beg to know whether the phrase "right hand of God" implies a true representation of God, or not? I find the following expressions even within the three first chapters of the Bible: "he (God) rested on the seventh day from all his work." "The Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day;" "And (God) said unto him (Adam) where art thou?" Did Moses mean by the term "rested" that God ceased to act from fatigue, and attempt to prove the mutableness of God? Did he mean by the phrase "God walked in the cool of the day" that he moved by means of legs, like men in general, in the cool of the day to avoid the heat of the weather? Or did he mean by the question "where art thou?" to imply the previous ignorance of the omniscient God? If so, Moses had strange ideas of Jehovah, and but little better than those maintained by his cotemporary Heathens. I am however inclined to think that Moses made use of these expressions conformably to the understanding of the ignorant Jews of his days, without subjecting himself to the charge of falsehood; and this, I am informed by Christians, was the opinion of ancient teachers called Fathers

of the Church, as well as of many modern learned Christians.

The Editor expresses his joy at "perceiving that the natives have begun to arouse themselves from that state of morbid apathy and insensibility which is a certain symptom of moral death and of universal corruption of manners &c." I cannot help feeling compassion for his total want of knowledge of the literary employment and domestic conduct of the native community at large, notwithstanding his long residence in India. During only a few years past, hundreds of works on different subjects, such as Theology, Law, Logic, Grammar, and Astronomy, have been written by the natives of Bengal alone. I do not wonder that they have not reached the knowledge of the Editor, who, in common with almost all his colleagues, has shut his eyes against any thing that might do the smallest credit to the natives. As to the "moral death" ascribed to them by the Editor, I might easily draw a comparison between the domestic conduct of the natives and that of the inhabitants of Europe, to shew where the grossest deficiency lies; but as such a dispute is entirely foreign to the present controversy, I restrain myself from so disagreeable a subject, under the apprehension that it might excite general displeasure.

As to the abusive terms made use of by the Editor, such as "Father of lies alone, to whom it (Hindooism) evidently owes its origin" "Impure fables of his false Gods" "Pretended Gods of Hindoos;" &c. common decency prevents me from making use of similar terms in return. We must recollect that we have engaged in solemn religious controversy and not in retorting abuse against each other.

I conclude this reply with expressing my hope that the Editor on noticing it will arrange his observations methodically, giving an answer to each of my questions in succession: that the public may judge with facility of the arguments employed on both sides.

NUMBER FOURTH
OF THE
BRAHMUNICAL MAGAZINE.
CHAPTER 1.
A REPLY.

TO CERTAIN QUERIES DIRECTED AGAINST THE VAIDANTA.

A few queries, written in the Bengalee language, having again issued from the Mission Press, Serampore, directed against the Vaidanta system of religion, and a Missionary Gentleman having brought these queries to the notice of our Friend Rammohun Roy, I naturally expected that the latter would publish a reply.

Disappointed in my expectation, and much hurt at the stigma thrown upon the religion which I profess, following the divine guidance of the Vaidas and the dictates of pure reason, I deem it incumbent upon me to defend what I believe to be true, against so unprovoked an aggression.

In his prefatory lines, the author says, that from reading the translation of the Vaidanta Durshuns by Rammohun Roy, he understands that the Vaidas declare a knowledge of God to be unattainable by man; and therefore he begs that Rammohun Roy will cease to impart their doctrines until he shall acquire a knowledge of the Deity from some other religious source.

This author, in common with a great number of his fellow-believers, not resting contented with the perversion and misrepresentation of the purport of his own Bible, has been zealously endeavouring to misquote the writings, revered by others as sacred authority, for the purpose of exposing them to ridicule. To prove this assertion I quote here the

very first passage of the translation of the abridgement of the Vaidanta Durshuna by Rammohun Roy, to which the Querist refers in his prefatory lines—viz.

“ The illustrious Vyas in his celebrated work the Vaidanta Durshuna insinuates in the first text, that it is “ absolutely necessary for mankind to acquire knowledge “ respecting the Supreme Being ; but he found from the “ following passages of the Vaidas that this inquiry is “ limited to very narrow bounds : —Vyas also, from the “ result of various arguments coinciding with the Vaidas, “ found that an accurate and positive knowledge of the “ Supreme Being, is not within the boundary of comprehension, i. e. what and how the Supreme Being is, cannot “ be definitely ascertained : he has, therefore in the second “ text, explained the Supreme Being by his effects and works, “ without attempting to define essence.”

Now, my readers will plainly perceive in the above quotation, that a perfect knowledge respecting the nature and essence of the Deity is declared in the Vaidanta “ to be unattainable ;” while a knowledge of his existence through “ his effects and works” is duly revealed by the Vaidas and consequently is zealously studied and imparted by us. We find in the Christian Scriptures declarations to the same purport. Psalm CXLV. “ Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised ; and his greatness is unsearchable” Job XXXVI. 26. “ God is great and we know him not : neither can the number of his years be searched out.” Will the author of these queries justify any one in following his example, by suggesting to the Missionary Gentlemen not to inculcate Christian doctrines ; on the ground that the Scriptures declare a knowledge of God and the number of the years of his existence unsearchable ? I think he will not listen to such a suggestion ; and will perhaps say in defence of the Missionaries, that since the real nature of God is said in Scripture to be unsearchable, they have never attempted to preach the divine nature and essence. If such be their defence, how could prejudice completely shut the eyes of this Interrogator against the plain declaration found in the translation of the Vaidanta both in Bengalee and English, which he says he has read : viz. “ He (Vyas) has therefore, in the second

"text, explained the Supreme Being by his effects and works without attempting to define his essence."

In answer to his first query i. e. "Did one God create the world or not?" I refer him to the next passage and to a subsequent passage of the same translation of the Vaidanta Durshuna : viz.

জগদ্ব্যাসা যতঃ।

বেদান্তসূত্রং।

"He by whom the birth, existence, and annihilation of the world is regulated, is the Supreme Being."

সর্বো বেদাৎপদমায়নন্তি।

ঋতিঃ।

"All the Vaidas prove nothing but the unity of the Supreme Being."

একমেবাদ্বিতীয়ং।

ঋতিঃ।

"God is indeed one and has no second."

These passages will, I hope, be sufficient to convince the Querist, that the doctrine of the unity of God is an essential principle of the Vaidanta system, however unwelcome it may be to him, as opposing his favourite notion of three Gods, or three Persons equally powerful under an abstract idea of Godhead.

In reply to his second query (i. e. "Does God preserve this world or not? and is his word our rule or not?") consisting of two questions, I have merely to quote the following passages of the same translation of the Vaidanta Durshuna which as they apply to each severally, I place under two separate heads :—1st. "He from whom the universal world proceeds, who is the support of the world, and he, whose work is the universe, is the Supreme Being." Who is the almighty and the sole regulator of the universe"—2nd, "God is declared to be the cause of all the Vaidas"—"Rules and rites (are) prescribed by the Vaida." The former quotations prove that God is the sole support of the world; and the latter declare that the Vaida is the law of God, revealed and introduced for our Rule and guidance.

As queries 3rd, 4th, and 5th, are in fact one query; I

repeat them as they stand and make one reply : " Is God " with or without attributes ? If God is destitute of all attributes, then how can a rule of right and wrong be recognized ? If you say that God is destitute of all attributes, " then what is the difference between your principles and " those of an atheist ? " I reply : The Vaidanta does not ascribe to God any power or attribute according to the human notion of properties or modes being attached or subordinate to their substance, such as the faculty of vision, or of wisdom, compassion, anger &c. in rational animals. Because these properties are sometimes found among the human race in full operation, and again ceasing to operate, as if they were quite extinct ; because the power of one of these attributes is often impeded by the operation of another ; and because the object in which they exist, depends upon special members of the body, such as the eyes, brain, heart &c. for the exercise of vision, wisdom, compassion &c.

In consideration of the incompatibility of such defects with the perfection of the divine nature, the Vaidanta declares the very identity of God to be the substitute of the perfection of all the attributes necessary for the creation and support of the universe, and for introducing revelation among men ; without representing these attributes as separate properties depended upon by the deity, in creating and ruling the world. Hence the Vaidanta confesses the impossibility of any perfect knowledge of the Divine nature, although to adapt itself to the understanding of beginners in the study of theology, it often ascribes to God such attributes as are held excellent among the human species ; as truth, mercy, justice. &c. See again the same translation. " The Vaidanta " having at first explained the Supreme Being by different " epithets, begins with the word Uthu or now, and declares, " that all descriptions which have been used to describe the " Supreme Being are imperfect (ideal), because he (the " Divine Being) by no means can be described."

Now, unbiased readers will judge, which of these two opinions is the more consistent with reason and divine revelation : To wit, the denying of properties to God according to the human notion of qualities in objects, as done by the Vaidanta ; or the equalizing of the number of Gods, or per-

sons under a Godhead, with the number of the supposed principal qualities belonging to the deity, (namely Creation, Redemption and Sanctification) as practised by the Querist and his fellow believers, who have provided themselves with a God the Father, for the work of creation, a God the Son, for redemption, and a God the Holy Ghost, for sanctification.

I do not wonder, that our religious principles are compared with those of atheists, by one, whose ideas of the divine nature are so gross, that he can consider God, as having been born * and circumcised †, as having grown ‡ and been subject to parental authority, § as eating and drinking, || and even as dying ¶ and as having been totally annihilated (though for three days only, the period intervening from the crucifixion of Christ to his resurrection,) ; nor can it give me any concern, if a person, labouring under such extravagant fancies, should, at the same time, insinuate atheism against us ; since he must thereby only expose himself to the derision of the discerning Public.

Let's to his sixth and seventh queries viz, " Do not wicked actions proceed in this world from the depravity of mankind ?" 7th. " By what penance can that guilt be expiated, which men contract by the practice of wickedness ?" I beg to observe, that a desire of indulging the appetites and of gratifying the passions is, by nature, common to man with the other animals. But the Vaidas, coinciding with the natural desire of social intercourse implanted in the human constitution, as the original cause of sympathy * with others, require of men to moderate those appetites and regulate those passions, in a manner calculated to preserve the peace and comfort of society, and secure their future happiness ; so that mankind may maintain their superiority over the rest of the animal creation, and benefit by one another. For each per-

* Luke 11. 7 † Luke 11. 21, ‡ Luke 11. 40. § Luke 11. 51, || Matth XI. 19. ¶ Mark XIV. 34.

* Even birds and beasts sympathise with their associates of the opposite sex and with their young, in proportion to the extent of their desire for social enjoyment.

son to indulge without restraint all the appetites and passions, would be destructive of the harmony of society, which mankind is naturally desirous to preserve. These sentiments are contained in the following passages of the same translation of the Vaidanta. viz,

শমদমায়ুপেতঃস্যাৎ তথাপি তু তর্হিধেহুদনতয়া তেভামবশ্যমনুষ্টেয়জ্ঞাৎ ॥
বেদান্তসূত্রং ॥

"A command over our passions and over the external senses of the body, and good acts, are declared by the Vaidā to be indispensable in the mind's approximation to God. They should, therefore, be strictly taken care of, and attended to, both previously and subsequently to such approximation to the Supreme Being."

In the constant internal struggles between this desire of indulgence, always working powerfully upon the mind, and the social inclination, displayed in various modes, according to the difference of circumstances, of habits, and of education, some yield often to the passions. In that case the only means of attaining an ultimate victory over them is, sincere repentance and solemn meditation, which occasion mental disquiet and anxiety forming the punishment of sin; and which are calculated to prevent future surrenders to the passions on similar occasions. The sin which mankind contract against God, by the practice of wickedness, is believed by us to be expiated by these penances; and not, as supposed by the Querist, by the blood of a son of man or son of God, who never participated in our transgressions.

His last query is, "Will mankind at last be certainly raised and judged? and will they suffer or enjoy according to their works or not?" In reply to which I beg to observe, that the Vaidanta does not confine the reward or punishment of good or evil works to the state after death, much less to a particular day of judgment; but it reveals positively, that a man suffers or enjoys, according to his evil or good deeds, frequently even in this world;—a doctrine which is not, I think, at variance with the first part of the Christian Bible. See the above translation.

পুরুষার্থেহি তঃ শাস্তিহিতি বাসবঃ ॥

বেদান্তসূত্রং ॥

"From devotion to God all the desired consequences "proceed" (meaning of course in this world also.)

"He, who has no faith in the Supreme Being, is rendered
 "subject to these gods (properly speaking grand objects.)"

In conclusion, he makes some other insinuations against the Vaidanta ; one of which is that it declares the mind to be God ; and consequently that those who adhere to this religion, must follow their natural propensities, and the suggestions of their own minds merely, not the revealed authority of God. I therefore quote these lines found in that very translation, from which the querist draws this conclusion , and leave the public to judge, whether he is not entirely deprived, even of common sense, by rooted religious prejudice, in examining the writings of others,, that are not persuaded to think exactly like him and his fellow-believers. viz. "The Vaidas
 "not only call the celestial representations deities ; but also,
 "in many instances, give this divine epithet to the mind, diet,
 "void space, quadrupeds, animals, and slaves :—But neither
 "any of the celestial gods nor any existing creature can be
 "considered the Lord of the universe, because the third
 "Chapter of the Vaidanta explains, that by these appellations of the Vaida, which denote the diffusive spirit of the
 "Supreme Being equally over all creatures, by means of
 "extension, his omnipresence is established." "Because
 "the Vaida declares the performance of these rules to be
 "the cause of the mind's purification and its faith in God."

If notwithstanding these explanations offered by the Vaidanta, the Querist persist in his attempt to stigmatise the Vaida, and thus argue, that any being declared by the Vaida to be God, though figuratively, should be considered as God in reality, by the followers of that system ; I would refer him to his own Bible, which in the same figurative sense applies the term "God" to the prophets and the chiefs of Israel ; and identifies God with abstract properties, such as love &c. ; and I then ask the Querist, whether he admits them to be real Gods and offers his worship to them ? and whether he be a follower of the dictates of the powerful passion of love in its most unlimited sense ?

His second insinuation is this ; that the Vaidanta does not forbid the worship of gods and goddesses ; and how then can the unity of God be inferred from that work ? I reply ; the Supreme Being is represented throughout the whole

Vaidanta System as the only object of true adoration ; of which the Querist will be convinced, if he refers to the following passages of the same translation : viz.

সৰ্ববেদান্তপ্রত্যক্ষোদনাদ্যবিশেষঃ ।

বেদান্তসূত্রং ॥

“ The worship authorised by all the Vaidas is of one nature ; as the direction for the worship of the only Supreme Being is invariably found in every part of the Vaida. The following passages of the Vaida affirm that “ God is the sole object of worship : viz.”

আত্মানমেবোপাসিত ।

ঋতি : ।

“ Adore God alone.”

তমেবৈকং জ্ঞানধ ।

ঋতি : ।

“ Know God alone.”

With regard to the suggestions about the worship of other objects besides the Deity, the following explanation is given in the Vaidanta. “ These, as well as several other texts of the same nature, are not real commands, but only direct those” (for instance idiots) “ who are unfortunately incapable of adoring the invisible Supreme Being, to apply their minds to any visible thing, rather than allow them to remain idle.”

In replying, as above, to all the Christian's queries and insinuations, I have confined my quotations to the translation of the abridgement of the Vaidanta—an Essay of 21 pages to which the Querist referred in his prefatory lines ; so that my readers may perceive that had the Querist read only that small work divesting himself of religious prejudice, he would not have needed to put those questions.

CHAPTER II

REASONS OF A HINDOO FOR REJECTING THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

The Querist then proceeds to direct personality, maintaining that, in common with Rammohan Roy, there are indivi-

duals in England, who regard the mind as God, and surrender themselves entirely to its suggestions : since they receive, he alleges, only such portions of the Bible as suit their convenience and reject the rest ; and confidently pronounces the doctrines which Rammohun Roy inculcates to be all atheistical.—As these individuals must be better qualified than I can be to vindicate themselves from the charge of perverting the Scriptures, I need say nothing on this subject. I cannot however totally pass over the charge of atheism against the doctrines which I, in common with my Friend, inculcate ; and therefore beg to be allowed to make in this instance a few observations, which may lead my readers to enter upon an impartial investigation and to compare the religious opinions which the followers of the Vaidanta maintain, with those that the Querist and his fellow Christians profess.

The Querist probably means, that these individuals reject or misinterpret that portion of the Bible, which relates to the Trinity and the atonement of Christ, both considered by the Querist and his fellow believers, as the essential principles of Christianity. I have, consequently, attentively read the Bible of Christians ; but to my great astonishment, I have been unable to find any explanation of the Trinity in that book. I have, therefore, directed my attention to their Creed and some of the works of celebrated Christian writers, in the former of which I find the Triune God thus explained :

“ The father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost “ is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God.” I shall, therefore, submit to the Querist and his fellow believers cases exactly parallel to this doctrine, as differently viewed by learned Christians, and ask him, whether he can ever persuade himself to admit their possibility ?—1st, John is homo or a man ; James is homo or a man ; and Jacob is homo or a man ; and yet there are not three homines or men but one man—2nd. At the time when the whole human race, as stated in the Christian Scriptures, consisted of only three persons, it might have been, in like manner, asserted, that, “ Adam is homo (or a person), Eve is homo (or a person) and Cain is homo (or a person) ; but there are not three homines (or persons) but one person.”

the three being included under the abstract notion of mankind.—3rd. The father is Sacerdos (or a Priest) the son is Sacerdos (or a Priest) and the Grand Son is sacerdos (or a Priest) and yet there are not three Sacerdotes (or priests) but one Priest under an abstract notion of the "Priesthood," 4th. Wisdom is qualitas (or a quality,) power is qualitas (or a quality) and love is qualitas (or a quality;) and yet there are not three qualitates (or qualities) but one quality. —5th. Creation is opus (or a work.) Redemption is opus (or a work,) Sanctification is opus (or a work), and yet there are not three opera or works, but one Work.

I regret that notwithstanding very great mental exertions, I am unable to attain a comprehension of this Creed.

These Missionary Gentlemen have come out to this country in the expectation, that grown men should first give up the use of their external senses; and should profess seriously, that although the Father is ONE God and the Son is ONE God and the Holy Ghost is ONE God, yet that the number of Gods does not exceed ONE—a doctrine which although unintelligible to others, having been imbibed by these pious men with their mothers' milk is of course as familiar to them, as the idea of the animation of the stoney goddess "Kalee" is to an idolatrous Hindoo, by whom it has, in like manner, been acquired in his infancy.

A man does not, under various circumstances, always refuse to believe things that are beyond his comprehension; but he will find it very hard, if not utterly impossible, to believe what is diametrically opposite to his senses, to his experience, to the uniform course of nature, and to the first axioms of reason: To wit, that there is first the Father-Deity, who is distinctly and by himself God, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent; that there is secondly the Son-Deity, who is distinctly and by himself God omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent; and that there is thirdly the Holy-Ghost Deity, (in the neuter Gender) which is distinctly and by itself God, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent; yet in defiance of the immutable principles of mathematical science, that these Deities amount to no more than one.

Exclusive of the writings of the ancient and modern popish Theologists and those of Dissenters from the Episcopal

creed, I find, to my still greater surprise, in the works of some celebrated Christian writers, who are held as the most distinguished members of the Church of England, the most palpably contradictory explanations given of this 'Trinity, some of which I here notice :

First Dr. Whaterland, Dr. Taylor, and Archbishop Secker maintain that the 'Trinity consists of three distinct, independent, and equal persons, constituting one and the same God ; thus representing the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost as three distinct substances under one Godhead.

2ndly. Dr. Wallis was an advocate for the Sabellian hypothesis ; and probably Archbishop Tillotson ; holding that three persons in the 'Trinity are only three modes or relations, which the Deity bears to his creatures—thus declaring the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost to be three qualities, existing of course in the abstract notion of the Godhead, which exists only in our imagination.

3rdly. Bishop Pearson, as well as Bishop Bull, and Dr. Owen suppose the Father to be an underived and essential essence and the Son to have received every thing by communication from God the Father. " There can be but one " person," (says Bishop Pearson) " originally of himself, subsisting in that infinite Being, because a plurality of more " persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity " of Gods." " The Son possessed" (says he,) " the whole " nature by communication not by participation. and in such " way that he was as really God as the Father." i. e. this Third explanation contradicts the First with regard to the original deity of the second and third persons, and is entirely opposed to the Second explanation.

4thly. Bishop Burgess supposes the three persons of the Deity to make one God, but does not allow that these persons are three beings ; urging that " the Scriptures declare " that there is but only one God—The same Scriptures " declare that there are three omnipresent persons ; but " there cannot be two omnipresent beings ; therefore the " three omnipresent persons can be only one God." According to this hypothesis, the 'Trinity is made up of three persons each of which is not a being ; i. e. of three nonentities.

5thly. In the system of Dr. Thomas Burnet, the Father is held to be a self-existent Being, the Son, and the Holy Ghost dependent; and he thinks that divine perfections and worship may be ascribed to each; which somewhat resembles the Arian Creed.

6thly. Mr. Baxter defines the three divine Persons to be Wisdom, Power, and Love; and illustrates his meaning by the vital power, intellect, and will in the soul of man; i. e. he compares the three persons with three qualities—an opinion which resembles what was maintained by Sabellius and his followers.

7thly. Bishop Gastrell says “the three names of God “the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, must denote a three-
“fold difference or distinction belonging to God, but such
“as is consistent with the unity and simplicity of the divine
“nature; for each of these includes the whole idea of God
“and something more. So far as they express the nature of
“God, they all adequately and exactly signify the same.
“It is the additional signification, which makes all the dis-
“tinction between them.” i. e. according to Bishop
Gastrell. “the Father includes the whole idea of God and
“something more; the Son includes the whole idea of God
“and something more; the Holy Ghost includes the whole
“idea of God and something more: while altogether, the
“Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost make one entire God,
“and no more.”—Here this learned Prelate introduces a new
axiom, viz. That a part is greater than, or, at least, equal
to the whole.

8thly. According to Mr. Howe's theory, there are three distinct, intelligent hypostases, each having a distinct, intelligent nature, united in some inexplicable manner so as to make one God in somewhat the same way as the corporeal, sensitive, and intellectual faculties are united to form one man i. e. he gives us to understand that the Godhead is something more than the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, in the same manner as a complete man is something more than the corporeal, sensitive, and intellectual faculties.

9thly. Dr. Sherlock says “The Father, Son, and Holy
“Ghost, are as really distinct Persons as Peter, James, and
“John, each of which is God. We must allow each Person

“to be a God. These three infinite minds are distinguished, “just as three created minds are, by self-consciousness. And “by mutual consciousness each person of these has the “wisdom, power, and goodness of the other two.” i. e. this Divine sets forth a system of perfect polytheism ; but does not, like the others, offer any apology for it.

10thly. Dr. Heber, the present Bishop of Calcutta, maintains that the second and third persons in the Trinity are no other than the angels Michael and Gabriel. It was the Second Person, who conversed with Moses from Mount Sinai ; and the Third Person, who constituted the Jewish Shekinah.

The Theory of the Godhead proposed by this pious and learned Prelate, altho, it is at variance with the opinions of several other Divines, must yet be gratifying to Hindoo Theologians, who have long cherished the doctrine of the Metempsychosis, or the transmigration of spirits from one body to another. Since the belief in the Second Person of the Godhead, originally a mere spirit, taking, at one time according to this theory, the form of an Angel (Michael) and afterwards assuming the body of Man (Jesus Christ) by means of natural birth, which was effected, as is said, by the Virgin Mary and the Angel Gabriel — countenances the doctrine of the migration of spirits from the bodies of superior to those of inferior creatures. 10 + 10.

Are not these explanations of the Trinity given by the persons most versed in the Scriptures sufficient to puzzle any man, if not drive him to atheism ? Supposing a Hindoo or a Musulman were ready and willing to embrace the Christian faith, would he not sincerely repent of his rashness, as soon as he discovered that the accounts of the essence of the Christian religion, given by the principal persons of the Church, are as opposite to each other as the west is to the east ? Would he not be utterly astonished at the idea, that a nation who are so celebrated for their progress in the arts and sciences, for the enjoyment of political and civil liberty, and for their freedom of inquiry and discussion, should neglect their religious faith so much as to allow it still to stand upon the monstrously absurd basis of popery ?

I myself, however, am not surprized at the many contradictory accounts they have given of the Trinity ; because when the building is the mere creature of fancy, it is not to be expected that its architects should well agree in their description of its form and proportions.—Nor do I wonder at this faith being forsaken by a great number of intelligent European gentlemen, whom the orthodox are fond of stigmatizing as Infidels ; since it appears to me, that any person endowed with a moderate share of common sense, not entirely perverted by early prejudices thrust upon him in the helpless infancy of his mind, must be able to tear off the parti-coloured veil of sophistry from the face of this Creed and discover its real monstrosity.

Instead of stigmatizing those gentlemen, the Missionaries ought, I think, to have thanked them gratefully, for the safe-standing of the frail edifice of their extraordinary creed ; since it is the indifference of a great number of learned Europeans about the religion which they from policy profess, accompanied with the bigotted adherence to Christianity imposed upon a considerable portion of men of the middling class, which, and which alone, has been hitherto the cause of the security of a faith contradictory to common sense and opposed to the evidence of the senses, in a nation so highly exalted by its literature.

Some well-meaning Christians plausibly argue, that, whether the doctrine of the Trinity be reasonable or not,—what does it signify, this being a mere matter of speculation,—if the practical parts of Christianity and its religious observances are salutary ?

In the first place I wish to know, whether the Missionaries preach the practical parts of Christianity separately from the doctrine of the Trinity and that of the atonement ; or whether, on the contrary, they do not consider these doctrines to be the fundamental principles of the Christian Faith ? so that no man can possibly benefit by the practical parts of Christianity, unless he is enabled to pervert his senses, so far as to believe in the truth of these doctrines ? If the latter be the case, these well meaning persons will, I trust, excuse the rejection of Christianity by the grown up natives of India, in consideration of the great difficulty or rather

impossibility every one must encounter who attempts to enforce belief upon himself or upon others.

In the second place, I take the liberty of asking these well-meaning gentlemen, whether it is a matter of speculation to believe one to be three and three to be one ? Whether it is a matter of opinion to bring ourselves to believe that a perfect man is perfect God ? or in other words, that a complete man is not a man ? Whether it is a matter of speculation to be convinced that an object confined to a small portion of the earth comprehends literally all the fulness of the Deity bodily, and spreads over the whole universe ? Is it also a matter of speculation that God whom Christians and their Scriptures represent as mere spirit and as the author of the universe, was of the very seed of the Jewish Patriarch Abraham, and of the Jewish King David ? If these be matters of opinion, what then are matters grossly repugnant to reason and contrary to fact ? The almighty and eternal Being (according to these Christian theologians) was born, grew to manhood, suffered and died a shameful death. Does this signify nothing ? Does it signify nothing to degrade our faculties and give up the use of our senses, while we are viewing the visible objects of nature ? If we do so in one thing, why not do it in another ? If we set out on this irrational career, where are we to stop ? May we not from the example set in Theology, lay aside the use of reason in other sciences also, and thereby impede the progress of knowledge and introduce incalculable evils into the world ? I therefore hope that these gentlemen will, after more mature consideration, discover the doctrine of the Trinity and the idea of a Mangod or Godman to be unnatural and pregnant with absurdity ; and not a mere innocent speculation.

If British Missionaries are under an obligation to preach Christianity to the natives of India, they ought for the glory of their nation, to hold so conspicuous a place among the people of the East, and also for the sake of their own characters as a Literary Body, to confine their instructions to the practical parts of Christianity, keeping entirely out of view the doctrine of the Trinity and the idea of a two or three fold nature of God and Man ; or God, Man, and Angel ;

which are, to say the least, very much calculated to lower the reputation of Britons both as a learned and as a religious people.

It is characteristic of protestant writers to expose to ridicule any other system of religion which they disapprove. For instance, some of their eminent writers have proceeded so far in attacking the doctrine of Transubstantiation maintained by the Catholics, as to apply to the bread which the Catholics consider as the real flesh of Christ, the epithet *Panarius Deus* or "Breaden God" &c.

Now I only beg to be allowed on this occasion to ask Protestant gentlemen, who think themselves justified in believing that a human body was, by supernatural power, in a literal sense filled with all the fullness of the Godhead, how they can object so violently to the opinion entertained by the Catholics that a piece of bread by the same supernatural power is filled with divine spirit? And if they can apply to Catholics the term "Worshippers of a Breaden God"—how can the professors of the Trinity disapprove of the terms "Worshippers of a Fleishy God, or Jew God" being applied to themselves?

Whoever, in fact, is unable to perceive the wide distinction between the supreme and eternal Being and a helpless mortal man, must surely confess, if endowed with the faculty of reason, that he has grossly abused it in contemplating the nature of the deity. The immense distance between the human and divine nature cannot be diminished by the efforts of any mortal; and therefore whoever accepts man, dead or alive, for his god, voluntarily sinks himself to the same unfathomable distance below the level of one of the human species. Should he then presume to claim the rank of man, he would thereby equalize his nature with that of his God and be justly chargeable with gross inconsistency. Indeed I do not see what can prevent his fellow believers, or man-worshippers, from accusing him of blasphemy—in making himself equal with God; or how rational men can avoid viewing him as the victim of early prejudices—however many sciences he may have studied, however many books he may have written, whatever titles of learning may have been bestowed upon him; and with whatever contempt he may

affect to regard the genuine Brahmunical religion.—I say the genuine Brahmunical religion, taught by the Vaidas, as interpreted by the inspired Munoo, not the popular system of worship adopted by the multitude. If a Christian were to insist on considering the latter with all its corruptions as the standard of Hindooism, then a Hindoo would also be justified in taking as standard of Christianity, the system of religion which almost universally prevailed in Europe previous to the fifteenth century of the Christian Era, and which is still followed by the majority of Christians (namely Catholics, Greeks, Armenians) with all its idols, crucifixes, saints, miracles, pecuniary absolutions from sins, trinity, transubstantiation, relics, holy water, and other idolatrous machinery.

With regard to the doctrine of the atonement, we are given to understand by Christians, that God the Father having been offended by the transgressions of the human race, resolved (tho' against the suggestion of his mercy) that he would not forgive them unless some adequate sacrifice were offered to him, so that his justice should not be disregarded through the influence of his mercy. Upon this resolution on the part of God the Father, God the Son having great compassion towards men guilty of sins unto death, took upon himself the human nature and offered to God the Father his own life as an adequate atonement, and thereby reconciled to the Father Deity as many men as would believe in the offer of his blood for the remission of sin.

The Missionary gentlemen hereby maintain, that although God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost were equally merciful and just, and equally averse to sin; yet the Father having a strict regard to the preservation of the balance of power between Mercy and Justice, did not suffer his Mercy to violate Justice, and insisted, that the sins of men should not be forgiven unless a human sacrifice were made to him. But the Son being more under the influence of mercy and totally regardless of justice, condescended to assume the human nature and to bear the punishment of their sin. Thus by offering himself as a sacrifice, he washed away their transgressions with his blood, without

expecting any sacrifice to be made to him, for the satisfaction of his Justice ; while God the Holy Ghost, again took no part whatever in the performance of the sacrifice, either as the Satisfier or the Satisfied, and remained quite neutral. Hence is it not evident, that God the Father is more strict about the observance of Justice than God the Son ? That God the Father was less liable to the influence of Mercy than God the Son ? and that God the Holy Ghost manifested neither Mercy nor Justice in the sacrificial stonement ? Do not these circumstances completely overthrow the doctrine which these gentlemen preach : viz. that God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are equally just and merciful ?

Secondly. They ascribe to God the attribute of justice according to the human notion of that attribute i. e. as a just judge can never be so influenced by his mercy as to forgive a man guilty of capital crimes, without inflicting upon him the punishment of death, so God never can violate justice through the influence of his mercy in forgiving sins unto death, without inflicting extreme punishment. Supposing, then, for the sake of argument, that divine justice can be viewed according to the standard of the human notion of justice, I ask whether it is consistent with the human notion of justice to release millions of men each guilty of sins unto death, after inflicting death upon another person, (whether God or man) who never participated in their sins, even though that person had voluntarily proposed to embrace death ? or whether it is not a great violation of justice, according to the human notion of it, to put an innocent person to a painful death for the transgressions of others, notwithstanding he in his human capacity manifested very great reluctance to that death ; as is admitted in the account of the life of Jesus Christ in Matthew Ch. XXVI. 37—39.

Thirdly. Sins are of two kinds ; that is sins against God merely, and sins against God and man, such as theft, robbery, deception &c. I therefore wish to know whether it is not an entire disregard of justice, according to the human notion, that the sins committed against one person should be forgiven by another, without his consent to such pardons ? Whether it is not an infringement of justice on the part of God the Son, according to the human notion of justice, to wash away

with his blood the sins of theft, robbery, or murder committed by one man against others, and to disregard their individual sufferings ? But if Christians really imagine that true believers in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ have their past sins as well against God as against man, washed away by his blood, are they not extremely presumptuous and culpable in inflicting punishment upon their fellow Christians for any crime they may have committed, knowing that atonement has already been made for it by the blood of their God, which was shed on the cross ? Yet we every day see Christians inflict on one another severe punishment, for the sins committed by them, notwithstanding the remission of their sins through their faith in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.

Fourthly. These Gentlemen believe, that the Son washes away the sins of those who place their faith in his vicarious sacrifice, and not of men in general. This shews that the act of pardoning the sins of men by God the Son, proceeded from a reciprocal consideration and not from his infinite mercy towards mankind.—As according to this doctrine, millions of inhabitants of remote countries, islands, and mountains, who never heard even the name of Christianity; have died in sin, ever since the time of the vicarious sacrifice offered by Christ ; without having it in their power to enter into the necessary bargain for the forgiveness of their sins by offering, in return their faith in the atonement made by Christ. But those who have been born in countries where they could readily acquire this faith, while they rely upon the possession of this as the means of purchasing their own salvation, inconsistently condemn such of their fellow-Christians as hope to be saved through a virtuous life and sincere repentance ; accusing them of presumption and self-sufficiency in pretending to be saved by such merits ; yet it is evident that the former who boast of their faith, are the persons really guilty of pride and self-sufficiency ; since for this single merit of theirs, they think themselves fully entitled to salvation ; and at the same time they condemn and depreciate the merits of others, who nevertheless consider that both faith and good works proceed from the grace of God.

These gentlemen are apt to find fault with and ascribe

unreasonableness to every other system of religion, shutting entirely their eyes upon the total want of reason and rationality in the faith which they themselves profess and preach. For, is there any notion more unreasonable and conducive to immoral practices than the idea, that God has blood ; and that that blood is offered by God to reconcile to God such men as, at any time during their lives, place faith in that blood of God ; however guilty these men may be of offending God and injuring their fellow-creatures.

As to their attempts at the converting of Hindoos to the Christian Faith, these Teachers of strange doctrines may now have been convinced by experience, after the exertions of a quarter of a century, that no grown up native of India possessed of common sense and common honesty, will ever be persuaded to believe in their self-contradictory Creed and that their religious efforts will be unavailing, unless they adopt, or be enabled to adopt, some unfair means for the promotion of Christianity. Since the Hindoo population in Bengal, from the circumstances of their early marriages, and their continual residence either at home or at an inconsiderable distance from their birth place, and from the enjoyment of local comfort under the peaceful sway of the British nation, has been encreasing with uncommon rapidity, and as they are, at the same time, prohibited from foreign trade by their religious prejudices, prevented from entering into the military service, owing to their habitual aversion to war ; and do not now, as in former times, receive gifts of lands free from assessments which tended much to encourage an idle life ; many families have already become very indigent and a greater number must, sooner or later, be reduced to poverty. It is, therefore, more than probable, that the most weak and needy among them may be induced, by the hope of worldly advantages, to sell their conscience and their religion, in the same manner as a great many Israelites have been persuaded to profess Christianity, by the severe policy, adopted towards Jews on the one hand, and the encouragement to apostatize held out on the other by Societies established in Europe for their conversion.

I shall now, in a few words, for the information of the Missionary gentlemen, lay down our religious creed. In

conformity with the Precepts of our ancient religion, contained in the Holy Vaidanta, though disregarded by the generality of moderns, we look up to ONE BEING as the animating and regulating principle of the whole collective body of the universe, and as the origin of all individual souls, which in a manner some what similar vivify and govern their particular bodies ; and we reject Idolatry in every form and under whatsoever veil of sophistry it may be practised, either in adoration of an artificial, a natural, or an imaginary object. The divine homage which we offer, consists in the practice of Duya or benevolence towards each other ; and not in a fanciful faith or in certain motions of the feet, legs, arms, head, tongue or other bodily organs, in a pulpit or before a temple—Among other objects in our solemn devotiou, we frequently offer up our humble thanks to God, for the blessings of British Rule in India and sincerely pray, that it may continue in its beneficent operation for centuries to come.

SHIVUPRUSAD SHURMA.

CALCUTTA, November 15, 1823.

A VINDICATION
of the
INCARNATION OF THE DEITY,
as the common basis
OF
HINDOOISM AND CHRISTIANITY,
AGAINST THE SCHISMATIC ATTACK*
of
R. TYTLER, ESQ. M. D.

INTRODUCTION.

'This Correspondence was occasioned by a passage in a letter of Dr. Tytler's published in the *BENGAL HURKARU* of the 30th of May 1823, directed against Rammohun Roy, a person who, as is well known, is strongly reprobated by the zealous both among Hindoos and Christians, for his daring impiety in rejecting the doctrine of Divine Incarnations. But the Doctor while censuring this stubborn Heretic most unwarrantably introduced contemptuous allusions to the Hindoo Deities, as will be seen from the passage referred to which is here subjoined :—

Extract from the Hurkaru of—May 3d 1823.

He (Rammohun Roy) thus proceeds in the same epistle. "Whether you be a faithful Believer in the Divinity of the Holy Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, or of any other mortal man ; or whether a Hindu declares himself a faithful Believer in the Divinity of his Holy Thakoor Trata RAM, or MUNOO—I feel equally indifferent about these notions." Here I pause, for the purpose of asking the candid Reader what would have been said, if, at the time Rammohun Roy continued in his belief of Shiba, Vishnu and Ganaisha, I had personally addressed a letter to him, replete with vituperation of him and his opinions ! Would it not have been asserted, and very justly, that I was attacking him, and his gods, and wounding the religious feelings of a Hindu ? Yet this Unitarian, as he now professes himself, thinks proper to leave the subject of discussion, namely a proposal to hold a "Religious conference," and tells me flatly that my Belief in the DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SAVIOUR is on a par with a Hindu's belief in his Thakoor !!!—Yes, Christian Readers, such is the fact ; and when I offer to defend myself from such vile imputation by arguments drawn from those Holy Scriptures to which this Unitarian himself appeals, I am given to understand, that this Reviler of my FAITH, the FAITH OF MY ANCESTORS, will not condescend to listen unless my reply receive the stamp of orthodoxy from the signature of a Missionary !!!

May 2, 1823.

R. TYTLER.

RAM DOSS'S FIRST LETTER TO DR. TYTLER.

The Editor of the Hurkaru having refused insertion to the following, it was privately forwarded to Dr. Tytler.

SIR,

To Dr. R. Tytler.

I happened to read a letter in the "Hurkaru" of the 3rd instant, under the signature of R. Tytler, which has excited

my wonder and astonishment. For I had heard that you were not only profoundly versed in the knowledge of the ancients, but intimately acquainted with the learning and opinions of the present age. But I felt quite disappointed when I perceived that you entertained ideas so erroneous respecting the Hindoo religion.

Is there any Hindoo who would be offended at being told by a believer in the INVISIBLE God, that this man is indifferent about his (the Hindoo's) faith in the divinity of his Holy THAKOOR and TRATA RAY or MUNOO ? We know that these self-conceited sects who profess reverence for only one DEITY are apt to express their indifference for the holy INCARNATION of the Divine Essence believed in by Hindoos as well as by Christians ; and in fact that the followers of any one religion have little respect for the opinions of those of another. But can this give concern or surprise to the enlightened and well-informed persons who have seen and conversed with various sects of men ?

I am more particularly astonished that a man of your reputed learning and acquirements, should be offended at the mention of the resemblance of your belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ with a Hindoo's Belief in his Thakoor ; because you ought to know that our religious faith and your's are founded on the same sacred basis, viz. the MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN THE FLESH, without any restriction to a dark or fair complexion, large or small stature, long or short hair. You cannot surely be ignorant that the Divine RAY was the reputed son of Dashruth, of the offspring of Bhuggeeruth, of the tribe of Rughoo : as Jesus was the reputed son of Joseph, of the House of David of the Tribe of Judah. RAY was the King of the Rughoos and of Foreigners, while in like manner Jesus was King of the Jews and Gentiles. Both are stated in the respective sacred books handed down to us, to have performed very wonderful miracles and both ascended up to Heaven. Both were tempted by the Devil while on the earth, and both have been worshipped by millions up to the present day. Since God can be born of the Tribe of Judah, how, I ask, is it impossible that he should be born of the Tribe of Rughoo, or of any other nation or race of men ? And as the human

form and feelings of **RAM** afford sceptics no good argument against his omnipresent and divine nature, it must be evident to you that this deluded sect of Unitarianism can lay no stress on the human form and feelings of Jesus Christ as disproving his divinity.

When therefore the resemblance is so very striking, and ought to be known to you as well as to every other man having the least pretensions to an acquaintance with the learning and religion of the Natives of India,—how is it possible that you can feel offended at the mention of a fact so notorious? You may perhaps urge, that there is a wide difference between a belief in **THREE** Persons in the Godhead as maintained by you, and a belief in three hundred and thirty millions of Persons in the Godhead, entertained by the **Hindoo**s : But as all such numerical objections are founded on the frail basis of human reason, which we well know is fallible, you must admit that the same omnipotence, which can make **THREE ONE** and **ONE THREE**, can equally reconcile the **UNITY** and **PLURALITY** of three hundred and thirty millions ; both being supported by a sublime mystery which far transcends all human comprehension.

The vain and narrow-minded Believers in one **INVISIBLE** God, accuse the followers of the Trinity, as well as us the sincere worshippers of **Ram** and other Divine Incarnations, of being Idolaters : and policy therefore might have suggested to you the propriety of maintaining a good understanding and brotherhood among all who have correct notions of the manifestation of God in the flesh ; that we may cordially join and go hand in hand, in opposing, and, if possible, extirpating the abominable notion of a **SINGLE** God, which strikes equally at the root of **Hindooism** and **Christianity**. However, it is not too late for you to reflect on your indiscretion, and atone for it by expressing your regret at having written and published any thing calculated to create dissension among the worshippers of Divine Incarnations.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

RAM DOSS.

DR. TYTLER'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

To **RAM DOSS**,

I have received your letter and beg you to receive my

best thanks, for the trouble you have put yourself to in sending it to me. It was my intention this evening to have proved that Hindoo Idolatry and Unitarianism are the same, and that they both proceed from the Devil.—Unfortunately Mr. Robison in consequence of the number who were anxious to attend, has requested me to postpone the meeting, to which of course I have acceded. But I am ready,—**AND** **MR. READY**,—to meet you and your runagate friend Rammohun Roy whenever you please, in public and private discussion, and let you know what a humble individual unsupported can do, armed with no other weapon than the sharp sword of the Gospel, in bringing to light the hidden works of darkness which are at present displayed in the damnable Heresy of Unitarianism of which you are the wretched tool. But neither you, Rammohun Roy, nor the second fallen ADAM dare meet me because you fear the **WORD** of **TRUTH**.

Your inveterate and determined
foe in the **LORD**.

May 6th, 1823.

(Signed)

R. TYTLER.

RAM DOSS'S REPLY TO A REMARK OF THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL HURKARU.

SIR, To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

After publishing in your Paper of the 3d instant Dr. Tytler's letter throwing out offensive insinuations against the Hindoo Religion as unworthy to be compared with the Christian, I am truly astonished at your refusal to insert my very friendly Reply and expostulation with him for the error and indiscretion into which he has fallen, and that you moreover defend him in the following words: "We would hint to " Ram Doss that there is in our opinion a wide difference between the belief which maintains God to have appeared in " the Flesh and that of the Hindoo who believes the appearance of the omnipotent Being in the shape of a Thakoor, " which if we are not mistaken, is composed of stone, metal " or wood."

I must remark, first, on the total unacquaintance, you have displayed, with the Hindoo Religion, notwithstanding your

residence in the capital of Bengal, in which, however, you are more excusable than Dr. Tytler, considering his high pretensions to learning. Can you find a single Hindoo in the whole of India, who imagines that the divine Ram, the son of Dushuruth by Koushilya his mother, according to the flesh, was composed either of wood, stone or metal ? If you can find even one, there may be some excuse for your mistake in supposing, what is so wide of the fact. You may, of course, find numerous consecrated images or statues of the Holy Ram, in the Hindoo temples, formed of wood and other materials, placed there for the pious purpose of attracting the attention of Devotees to that Divine Incarnation ;—although many good Hindoos do not consider such representations as necessary, and worship Ram directly without the intervention of any sensible object. But can you suppose for a moment that a model or picture of any person, whether divine or human, can identify that being with such representation or convert the original existence into the same materials ? If this were the case, then the number of men so unfortunate as to have statues or portraits of themselves made must lose their real essence—their original elements necessarily degenerating into stone, or paint and canvass.

But it is indisputable that neither the image of the Holy Jesus in Roman Catholic Churches, nor the representations of the Divine Ram in the Hindoo Temples, are identified with either of those sacred persons.

As you have refused to publish my letter in answer to Dr. Tytler's attack, I shall take an opportunity of sending it directly to himself for his consideration and reply, and purpose very soon laying this controversy before the public through some other channel with proper mention of your partial conduct, in circulating Dr. Tytler's insulting insinuations against the Hindu Religion and withholding my answer thereto for its vindication. I expect you will kindly insert this letter in your Paper of tomorrow along with a justification of your own observations of this morning.

I am, Sir, your most obedient Servant,

RAM DOSS.

REMARKS OF THE EDITOR RELATIVE TO THE FOREGOING.

(Contained in the Bengal Hurkaru of the 8th May.)

In our subsequent pages will be found a letter signed Ram Doss, which we insert with pleasure, with a desire of convincing him that we are really impartial in our views of the subject of which it treats. In explanation of our refusal to insert the former letter of Ram Doss, we owe it to him to say that although it justly deserves, the appellation of a "very friendly reply" and altho' it was written with much ability, yet it appeared to us to overstep the limits we have prescribed to ourselves, by entering too far into the subject of the original dispute between the two classes of religious professors, instead of being confined to the discussion of the subject between Ram Mohun Roy and Dr. Tytler, namely the right of the latter to demand, and of the former to afford, facilities for the purpose of the discussion of the point at issue between them. It was under these circumstances and with this feeling that we declined to insert RAM DOSS'S communication, and we beg to assure him that it was not from any disrespect to him, or partiality for Dr. Tytler or his doctrines.

Having disposed of this part of the subject, we trust, to the satisfaction of RAM DOSS, we shall simply remark on the other, that we never intended to intimate that any sensible Hindoo could for one moment suppose that God was personally present in an image of brass, stone or metal; but we have no hesitation in asserting that such an opinion does prevail, not only among the Hindoos, but amongst the ignorant of all classes whose religious faith prescribes the worship of images as the medium of access to the Deity. We really ought not to enter on the discussion of any of the points connected with the religious worship of the Hindoos, as we have had but very few opportunities of making ourselves acquainted with them, and if we are now in any error on these subjects, we trust that RAM DOSS will attribute it to the causes which we have thus explained, and not to any feeling of partiality towards Dr. Tytler, or of misrepresentation of the objects of his own worship.

RAM DOSS'S FIRST CHALLENGE TO DR. R. TYTLER.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

Being disappointed in my just expectation of having my answer to Dr. Tytler's insinuations inserted in your Paper, I yesterday sent it to the Doctor himself for his consideration ; but he avoids making a reply thereto, and in answer to my arguments, merely returns abuse against me, and likewise against our common enemies, the Unitarians, for which last I of course care nothing. 4228

I take this opportunity of informing the Public that this Goliath, notwithstanding his high pretensions to learning, and presumption in setting himself up as the champion of Christianity, shrinks from the defence of the charges he has brought against Hindooism, and that he refuses to co-operate with me in opposing Unitarianism, although he declares in his note to me that it is a system of damnable heresy proceeding from the Devil.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant,

May 7, 1823.

RAM DOSS.

DR. TYTLER'S REPLY TO RAM DOSS.

SIR,

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

As I do not intend this letter to have any direct reference to the subject of Religious discussion, you will oblige me by giving it insertion into the columns of the Hurkaru. Two days ago I received an Epistle subscribed Ram Doss, which I was led to conclude must have been written by some Unitarian under a pseudonymous signature. But it appears from a letter, which is published in your paper of this day, I may have been mistaken ; and I am, therefore, anxious to inform Ram Doss, if he be a real person, that I consider there is no book at present in possession of Hindoos,—the Mahabharata and Ramayuna not excepted,—of higher antiquity

than the entrance of the Musulmans into India,—say about 800 years from the present period. The legends attached to the Avatars are merely perverted, and corrupted copies of the Holy Scriptures in the possession of Christians, and have no particular relation to the ancient religion, whatever it may have been, of the inhabitants of this country. Should Ram Doss therefore be a real person, and wish to obtain information on those topics, it will afford me sincere pleasure to meet him, either at my own house or any other he may appoint, at some hour convenient to us both, for the purpose of explaining the arguments which support the views I have taken of the Modernness of the religious system at present followed by the Hindoos.

Your obedient Servant.

May 8, 1823.

R. TYTLER.

RAM DOSS'S SECOND CHALLENGE TO Dr. TYTLER.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

Dr. Tytler having been unable to make a direct reply to the arguments conveyed in my letter to him dated the 5th instant, has taken refuge in your Paper, knowing very well that he would prevail upon you to insert every assertion that he might make against our Sacred Books and Holy Incarnations, and that you as a Christian would excuse yourself for declining to give publicity to my retaliation upon him.

I therefore challenge him through your Pages for a reply to my arguments in the shape of a letter, so that I may endeavour through some other means to publish all our correspondence for the consideration and judgement of the Public.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

9th, May 1823.

RAM DOSS.

Dr. TYTLER'S REPLY TO RAM DOSS.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

Your Correspondent Ram Doss in "informing the public,"

that I consider "Unitarianism a system of damnable heresy proceeding from the Devil," has forgot to mention that such was also my expressed opinion to him respecting the superstitions to which he is so extremely partial. Under those circumstances is it reasonable to expect, I will allow him to co-operate with me, as he calls it, "against our common enemies," when in fact I maintain Unitarianism to be nothing more than a new name for Hindoo Idolatry?

Your Obedient Servant,

Calcutta, May 10, 1823.

R. TYTLER.

RAM DOSS'S THIRD CHALLENGE To Dr.
TYTLER.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

One of the objects of my Letter to Dr. Tytler, was to solicit the co-operation of the Doctor in opposing Unitarians—The other, to refuse his insinuations against Hindooism and prove that it was founded on the same sacred basis (the Manifestation of God in the flesh) with Doctor Tytler's own Faith.

From the Doctor's letter in your paper of this morning, I see he positively shrinks from entering the field with me against Unitarianism, leaving me thus to encounter the danger and reap the glory single-handed.

I now request to be informed through the medium of your paper, whether the Doctor also flinches from justifying his insinuations against the Hindoo Religion, and replying to my letter proving Hindooism and Christianity to rest on the same sacred foundation.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant,

May 12, 1823.

RAM DOSS,

Dr. TYTLER'S REPLY TO RAM DOSS.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

The assertion of Ram Doss, that "I shrink from entering the field against Unitarianism, leaving (him) thus to encounter

the danger and reap the glory single handed," when all Calcutta is acquainted with the contrary, and no one better than the Unitarians themselves, is really too absurd to require notice.

In support of what this writer calls "my insinuations against the Hindoo Religion," I refer him to the histories of Buddha, Saluvahana, and Chrishna, and maintain they comprise nothing more than perverted copies of Christianity. Let him shew the reverse if he can.

Your Obedient Servant,

Calcutta, May 13, 1823.

R. TYTLER.

RAM DOSS'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

You are aware that I have three times through the medium of your paper, called upon Dr. Tytler, to reply to the ARGUMENTS contained in the letter, forwarded to him by me and the receipt of which he acknowledged in a torrent of abuse, and that he has as often as thus publicly called upon, returned an evasive answer, which proves that he inwardly shrinks from the combat.

With a view to defend his offensive insinuations, against Hindooism, he now refers me to the Histories of Buddha, (the head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism) Saluvahana (an Indian Prince) and Chrishna a divine Incarnation without attempting to bring forward from these any thing against the justness of my arguments.—I now, Sir, beg leave to appeal to you, whether if any Hindoo were to make insinuations against the Christian Religion, when called to defend them he would be justified in merely referring Christians to the Books of the Jews (a tribe equally inimical to Christianity) or Gibbon's History of the Roman Empire, or to a whole History of Jesus Christ, without adducing any particular Passage? I now for the FOURTH and last time call upon the Doctor, either to answer precisely my arguments already in his possession, or confess publicly that he is totally unable to justify his insinuations against a Religion founded on the Sacred basis of the manifestation of God in the flesh, and

that knowing the badness of his cause, he shrinks from meeting me on the fair field of Regular Argument, instead of which he has given me only abuse.

I have nothing to say respecting his mode of opposing our Common enemies the Unitarians, and grant him freely the honour of his individual exertions—Notwithstanding I think it proper to suggest the expediency of Common believers in Divine incarnations (like the Doctor and myself) joining hand in hand in opposing our inveterate enemy. Our chance of success must be greater when our Force is united, than when it is divided.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant

May 14, 1823.

RAM DOSS.

DR. TYTLER'S REPLY TO RAM DOSS.

This Reply was in a Postscript to a Letter of Dr. Tytler's (dated May 15,) addressed to the Editor of BENGAL HURKARU, and published in that Paper of the 16th May.

"I request" (said the doctor) to be informed by your sapient correspondent Ram Doss, in what manner he proves Buddha to be "the head of a tribe" inimical to Hindooism."

RAM DOSS'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

The only reply which Dr. Tytler makes to my Fourth Challenge published in your paper yesterday is as follows viz.

"P. S. I request to be informed by your Sapient Correspondent Ram Doss in what manner he proves Buddha to be the head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism."

I now call on the Public to pronounce whether this query can be considered as a reply to the arguments contained in my letter forwarded to the Doctor, repelling his offensive insinuations and proving that Hindooism and Christianity are founded on the same basis? Or if it be not evidently a mere pretence for evading the question? Fully warranted in anticipating a verdict in my favor, I ask what opinion will the world form of a man who with some pretensions to

learning and great professions of Religion, while defying the whole world in the field of Religious discussion, first utters degrading insinuations against a Faith founded on exactly the same basis as his own, and then when repeatedly challenged to justify this conduct resorts to such Shuffling and Evasion? However to oblige the Doctor as a fellow-believer in and worshipper of Divine Incarnations, I will inform him (altho' it has no bearing on the question) that Buddha or Booddha, is the head of the sect of Bouddhus, who derive their name from him in the same manner as Christians do from Christ. That this sect is inimical to Hindooism is proved by the fact that they deny the existence of a Creator of the Universe, in whom the Hindoos believe, and also despise many of the Gods worshipped by the latter. There are hundreds of works published by them against each other which are in general circulation. But all this has nothing to do with my arguments which the Doctor by evading * virtually confesses he is unable to answer. I therefore denounce him a defamer of Hindooism, a religion of the principles of which he is (or at least appears to be) totally ignorant.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant,

Friday, 16th May, 1823.

RAM DOSS.

DR. TYTLER'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

PUBLISHED IN THE HURKARU OF MAY 22D.

"The sapient Ram Doss, now changes his tone,—and tells us the Bouddhists, "despise many of the Gods worshipped by the Hindoos." It hence follows that some of the Hindoo deities must be objects of their adoration. And yet this writer asserts Buddha to be the "head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism," while his own statement proves Hindoo Gods to be the objects of Buddhaic veneration!!

* "Loading" was in the Newspaper erroneously printed instead of "evading;" and some other typographical errors of a similar kind as well as mistakes of the transcriber, have been corrected by the Author. R. D.

RAM DOSS'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

In your paper of this day, Dr. Tytler notices my fifth Challenge, calling upon him to answer the arguments contained in my letter forwarded to him some weeks ago, repelling his offensive insinuations against Hindooism.—But how does he justify himself? “The sapient Ram Doss” (says he) “now changes his tone and tells us the Buddhists ‘despise many of the Gods worshipped by the Hindoos’ ‘It hence follows that some of the Hindoo deities must be objects of their adoration. And yet this writer asserts ‘Buddha to be the head of a tribe inimical to Hindooism,’ ‘while his own statement proves Hindoo Gods to be the ‘objects of Buddhic Veneration.’”

I now beg to call the attention of the Public, Christians and not Christians to the above passage, and request them to pronounce whether the Doctor thereby proves that Hindooism cannot (as he insinuated) be compared with Christianity, or refutes my position, that these two religions are founded on the same sacred basis, viz. the Manifestation of God in the Flesh? And I now call on the world to judge, whether the person who can resort to such shuffling and evasion have any just claim to the character of a man of learning, or a man of probity?—What name is bestowed on the man who thus shrinks from meeting the arguments of his opponent fairly and candidly, and trembling at the force of truth, is glad to make his escape by any mean subterfuge?

It is almost self-degradation or a prostitution of reason to treat his last remark, above quoted, as worthy of notice, viz that as “Bouddhists despise many of the Gods worshipped by the Hindoos, it hence follows that some of the Hindoo deities must be subjects of their ‘adoration’”—Indeed!! In what school of wisdom did the learned Doctor acquire his Logic? Altho, I despise or dislike several members of a family, is this a proof that I must adore the rest? May I not regard the rest with indifference, or be unacquainted with them? But granting even that Bouddhists do worship some of the Hindoo Gods, while they despise others, may they

not still be inimical to Hindooism ? For, don't the Jews despise one of the Christian Gods, worship another, and are indifferent to a third ; and yet are they not inveterate enemies of Christianity ?

I now only wish to know from what College or University the Doctor procured a Certificate, authorizing him to assume the Title of M. D. and whether that seat of Learning in the distribution of its Academic Honors usually selects such worthy objects ? I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant.

Thursday, 22d May 1823.

RAM DOSS.

P. S. I congratulate the Doctor on his Victory (as reported by himself in your paper of to-day) over our common enemies the Unitarians (these deluded deniers of Divine Incarnations) and I regret I was not present to share in the triumph. R. D.

Dr. TYTLER being now it appears completely silenced a Friend under the signature of A CHRISTIAN, came forward to his assistance in the following Letter.

LETTER OF A CHRISTIAN TO RAM DOSS.

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

It is gratifying to the lovers of science to behold a few intelligent Hindoos emerging from the degraded ignorance and shameful superstition in which their fathers for so many centuries have been buried. It is no less pleasing to the friends of humanity, to find that one of the most learned of the Hindoo Brahmuns has not only abandoned the doctrine which countenances the cruel and abominable practice of matricide, but also ably confuted his compeers, who were advocates for having human victims sacrificed to Moloch.

On the other hand it is a sad contemplation, that these very individuals who are indebted to Christians for the civil liberty they enjoy, as well as for the rays of intelligence now beginning to dawn on them; should in the most ungenerous manner insult their benefactors by endeavouring to degrade their religion, for no other reason, but because they cannot comprehend its sublime Mysteries.

My attention has been particularly attracted to this subject by a letter signed "RAM DOSS" which appeared in your paper of yesterday.

This Hindoo with whom I have no personal acquaintance had the arrogance to lay before the public the following passage " I now call on the public to pronounce whether this query can be considered as a reply to the arguments contained in my letter forwarded to the Doctor, repelling his offensive insinuations and proving that Hindooism and Christianity are founded on the same basis ? Ram Doss here appeals to the public, and he will of course grant me the same privilege. I will therefore ask,—Christian Readers, are you so far degraded by Asiatic effeminacy as to behold with indifference your holy and immaculate RELIGION thus degraded by having it placed on an equality with Hindooism—with rank idolatry—with disgraceful ignorance and shameful superstition ?

Will Ram Doss or his associates be pleased to inform me, if the Incarnation of his God was foretold by Prophets through a period of four thousand years ? Or will he demonstrate the mission or divine incarnation of his Deity by incontestable and stupendous miracles such as Christ wrought ? Will he assert that the doctrine of Hindooism is as pure and undefiled as that of Christianity ? Or in fine will he prove that the human character has ever been exalted by any religious system so much as by the sweet influence of Christianity ?

If RAM DOSS is not able satisfactorily to clear up a single point of what I now submit to his serious consideration, it is manifest, that in common civility, he should refrain from insulting Christians by putting their religion on a comparison with Hindooism.

Ram Mohun Roy, who appears to me to be the most learned of the Hindoos, is so far from making such odious and offensive remarks, that he apparently gives the preference to Christianity. Vide, his First Appeal entitled " the precepts of Christ the guide to peace and happiness." I regret the learned Brahmun was interrupted by the intemperate zeal of the Baptists in the praise-worthy course he intended to have pursued as set forth in his preface to the work above alluded to.

I conclude by recommending your sapient Correspondent RAM DOSS to employ his time and talents in laudable and pious

endeavours to reclaim his Countrymen from idolatry, rather than attempt to investigate mysteries that are far above the weak comprehensions of man. I also recommend him to beware of such Christians as are carried away with every wind of doctrine, and who know not what they do.

I am, Sir, Your Obedt. Servant, A CHRISTIAN.

RAM DOSS'S REPLY TO THE CHRISTIAN.

[Published in a Pamphlet containing an account of Dr. Tytler's Lecture circulated with the Bengal Hurkaru Newspaper.]

To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.

SIR,

I regret to observe by the Letter in your Paper of this morning signed "A Christian," that in repelling the offensive insinuations of Dr. Tytler against the Hindoo Religion, I am considered by one of the Christian denomination as endeavouring to degrade his "Faith."

It is well known to you, Sir that I privately sent a Letter to the Doctor, refuting his position in the most friendly, calm, and argumentative manner, to which he returned a note loading me with the grossest abuse; consequently I thought myself justified in challenging him publicly to make a reply to my arguments. The Christian therefore cannot conceal from himself that it is I and my Faith which have been vilified and abused and that in return, I have offered not insult, but merely reason and argument; for it cannot be considered insult for a man to say that another religion is founded on the same basis with his own, which he believes to be all that is venerable and sacred.

If by the "Ray of Intelligence" for which the Christian says we are indebted to the English, he means the introduction of useful mechanical arts, I am ready to express my assent and also my gratitude; but with respect to Science, Literature or, Religion, I do not acknowledge that we are placed under any obligation. For by a reference to History it may be proved that the World was indebted to our ancestors for the first dawn of knowledge, which sprung up in the East, and thanks to the Goddess of Wisdom, we have still a philosophical and copious language of our own which distin-

guishes us from other nations who cannot express scientific or abstract ideas without borrowing the language of foreigners.

Ram Mohun Roy's abandonment of Hindoo doctrines (as "A Christian" mentions) cannot prove them to be erroneous; no more than the rejection of the Christian Religion by hundreds of persons who were originally Christians and more learned than Ram Mohun Roy, proves the fallacy of Christianity. We Hindoos regard him in the same light as Christians do Hume, Voltaire, Gibbon and other Sceptics.

Before "A Christian" indulged in a tirade about persons being "degraded by Asiatic effeminacy" he should have recollected that almost all the ancient prophets and patriarchs venerated by Christians, nay even Jesus Christ himself, a Divine Incarnation and the founder of the Christian Faith, were ASIATICS so that if a Christian thinks it degrading to be born or to reside in Asia, he directly reflects upon them.

First.—The "Christian" demands "Will RAM DOSS or his associates be pleased to inform me if the Incarnation of his "God was foretold by Prophets through a period of four thousand years?" I answer in the affirmative.—The Incarnation of Ram was foretold in the works of many holy and inspired men for more than 4000 years previous to the event, in the most precise, and intelligible language; not in those ambiguous and equivocal terms found in the Old Testament, respecting the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, an ambiguity which it is well known has afforded our common enemies the Unitarians a handle for raising a doubt of Jesus Christ being a real Manifestation of God in the flesh.

Secondly.—The Christian demands of RAM DOSS "Will he demonstrate the mission or divine incarnation of his deity "by incontestable and Stupendous Miracles such as Christ wrought?" I answer, Yes: The divine Ram performed miracles more Stupendous, not before multitudes of Ignorant people only but in the presence of Princes and of thousands of learned men, and of those who were inimical to Hindooism. I admit that the Jeins and other unbelievers ascribed Ram's miraculous power to a Demoniackal Spirit, in the same manner as the Jews attributed the miracles of Jesus to the power of Beelzebub; but neither of these objections are worthy

of notice from believers in Divine Incarnations ; since the performance of the miracles themselves is incontestably proved by tradition.

Thirdly.—The Christian asks “ Will he (Ram Dass) assert that the Doctrine of Hindooism is as pure and undefiled as that of Christianity ? ” Undoubtedly, such is my assertion : and an English translation of the Vaidanta as well as of Munoo (which contains the essences of the whole Vaidas) being before the public, I call on all reflecting men to compare the two religions together and point out in what respect the one excels the other in purity ? Should the Christian attempt to ridicule some part of the ritual of the Vaidas I shall of course feel myself justified in referring to ceremonies of a similar character in the Christian Scriptures : and if he dwell on the corrupt notions introduced into Hindooism in more modern times, I shall also remind him of the corruptions introduced by various sects into Christianity. But A Christian must know very well that such corruptions cannot detract from the excellence of Genuine Religions themselves.

Fourthly.—The CHRISTIAN asks, “ Will he (Ram Dass) prove that the human character has ever been exalted by any system of religion so much as by the sweet influence of Christianity.” In reply, I appeal to History, and call upon the CHRISTIAN to mention any religion on the face of the earth that has been the cause of so much war and bloodshed, cruelty and oppression for so many hundred years as this whose “ sweet influence ” he celebrates.

That propriety of conduct found among the better sort of Christians is entirely owing to the superior education they have enjoyed, a proof of which is, that others of the same rank in society, altho’ not believers in Christianity are distinguished by equal propriety of conduct, which is not the case with the most firm believers, if destitute of Education or without the means of improvement by mixing in company with persons better instructed than themselves.

It is unjust in the CHRISTIAN to quarrel with Hindoos because (he says) they cannot comprehend the sublime mystery of his Religion ; since he is equally unable to comprehend the sublime mysteries of ours, and since both these

mysteries equally transcend the human understanding, one cannot be preferred to the other.

Let us however return to the main question, viz. that **THE INCARNATION OF THE DEITY IS THE COMMON BASIS OF HINDOOISM AND CHRISTIANITY.** If the manifestation of God in the flesh is possible such possibility cannot reasonably be confined to Judea or Udyodhya ; for God has undoubtedly the power of manifesting himself in either country, and of assuming any colour or name he pleases. If it is impossible, as our common enemies the Unitarians contend, such impossibility must extend to all places and persons. I trust, therefore, the Christian will reflect with great seriousness on this subject and will be kind enough to let me know the result.

I am, Sir, your most Obedt. Servt.

Calcutta, May 23, 1823.

RAM DOSS.

Ram Doss having heard nothing more publicly or privately from Dr. Tytler or "A Christian" the correspondence here concluded, and the arguments adduced in vindication of the incarnation of the Deity as the Common Basis of Hindooism and Christianity consequently remain unanswered.

FINIS.

HUMBLE
SUGGESTIONS
TO
HIS COUNTRYMEN
who believe
IN THE
ONE TRUE GOD :
BY
PRUSUNNU KOOMAR THAKOOR.



Those who firmly believe on the authority of the Vaidas,
that

একমেবাদ্বিটিয়ং ॥

“God is one only without an equal” ;
and that

বৈদ বাজা ন মনসা প্রাপ্য শক্যোন চক্ৰমা ।

অদ্বীতি কুদ্যোহিন্যত্র কথং তদুপলভ্যতে ॥

“He cannot be known either through the medium
of language, thought, or vision : how can he be known
except as existing, the origin and support of the universe !”
and who endeavour to regulate their conduct by the
following precept,

যথৈবান্যাপরন্তরং দুঃখং শুভমিচ্ছত।

সুখদুঃখানি তুল্যানি যথাস্থি তথা পরে ॥

“ He who is desirous of eternal happiness should regard another as he regards himself, and the happiness and misery of another as his own ”

ought to manifest the warmest affection towards such of their own countrymen as maintain the same faith and practice ; even although they have not all studied the Vaidas for themselves, but have professed a belief in God only through an acquaintance with their general design. Many among ten classes of Sunnyasees, and all the followers of Gooroo Nanuk, of Dadoo, and of Kubeer, as well as of Suntu &c. profess the religious sentiments above mentioned. It is our unquestionable duty invariably to treat them as brethren. No doubt should be entertained of their future salvation, merely because they receive instructions, and practise their sacred music, in the vernacular dialect. For Yaj-nuvulkyu, with a reference to those who cannot sing the Hymns of the Vaidas, has said

ঋগাথাপাদিকানকবিহিতা ব্রহ্মগীতিকা ।

গেযমেতৎ তদভ্যাসাৎপরং ব্রহ্মাধিগচ্ছতি ॥

“ The divine hymns Rik, Gatha, Panika, and Dukshubihita should be sung ; because by their constant use man attains supreme beatitude.”

বীণাবাদনতজ্জঃ কতিজ্জাতিবিশারদঃ ।

তালজ্জশ্চাপ্রয়াসেন মোক্ষমার্গনিয়চ্ছতি ॥

“ He who is skilled in playing on the lute (veena), who is intimately acquainted with the various tones and harmonies, and who is able to beat time in music, will enter without difficulty upon the road of salvation.”

Again, the Shivu Dhurmu as quoted by Rughoonundun, says,

সংস্কৃতৈঃ প্রাকৃতৈর্বা কৈবঃ শিষ্যমনুরূপতঃ ।

দেশভাষাদ্যুপায়ৈশ্চ বোধয়েৎসমগ্রঃ স্কৃতঃ ॥

“ He is reputed a Gooroo who according to the capacity of his disciple instructs him in Sungskrit whether pure or corrupt, in the current language of the country, or by any other means.”

Amongst foreigners, those Europeans who believe God to be in every sense ONE, and worship HIM ALONE in spirit, and who extend their benevolence to man as the highest service to God, should be regarded by us with affection, on the ground of the object of their worship being the same as ours.

We should feel no reluctance to co-operate with them in religious matters, merely because they consider Jesus Christ as the Messenger of God and their Spiritual Teacher : for oneness in the object of worship and sameness of religious practice should produce attachment between the worshippers.

Amongst Europeans, those who believe Jesus Christ to be God himself, and conceive him to be possessed of a particular form, and maintain Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be one God, should not be treated in an unfriendly manner. On the contrary, we should act towards them in the same manner as we act towards those of our countrymen who, without forming any external image, meditate upon Ram and other supposed incarnations, and believe in their unity.

Again, those amongst Europeans who believing Jesus Christ to be the Supreme Being, moreover construct various images of him, should not be hated. On the contrary, it becomes us to act towards those Europeans in the same manner as we act towards such as believe Ram &c. to be incarnations of God, and form external images of them. For, the religious principles of the two last mentioned sects of foreigners are one and the same with those of the two similar sects among Hindoos, although they are clothed in a different garb.

When any belonging to the second and third classes of Europeans endeavour to make converts of us, the believers in the only living and true God, even then we should feel no resentment towards them, but rather compassion, on account of their blindness to the errors into which they themselves have fallen. Since it is almost impossible, as every day's experience teaches us, for men, when possessed of wealth and power, to perceive their own defects.



